

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 301

TM 840 483

AUTHOR Reisman, Jane; Borman, Kathryn
TITLE Gaining Access to Work Settings: A Tale of Two Cities.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Apr 84
GRANT NIE-G-83-0005
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (68th, New Orleans, LA, April 23-27, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Business; *Field Studies; Industry; *Organizations (Groups); Research Methodology; *Research Problems; School Business Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Boundaries; *Open Systems Theory

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses the specific concerns of gaining entry into formal and complex organizational settings, specifically businesses, to conduct field research. Accounts of other researchers' experiences and the authors' own field data are analyzed and viewed within an open systems organizational framework. Through the use of metaphors relating to boundaries such as "boundary maintenance" and "boundary transactions", an open systems theory provides useful guidelines and decision rules which can be invoked when researchers negotiate access to business. (Author)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED247301

GAINING ACCESS TO WORK SETTINGS:
A TALE OF TWO CITIES

Jane Reisman
The Ohio State University

Kathryn Borman
University of Cincinnati

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Reisman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

This paper was prepared for delivery at the 1984 American Edu-
cational Research Association annual meeting in New Orleans,
Louisiana.

The research reported here was funded by The National Institute of Educa-
tion, under grant number NIE-C-83-0005. Contractors undertaking such projects
under government sponsorship are encouraged to freely express their judgement
in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not,
therefore, necessarily represent official National Institute of Education
position or policy.

JM 840 483

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses the specific concerns of gaining entry into formal and complex organizational settings, specifically businesses, to conduct field research. Accounts of other researchers' experiences and the authors' own field data are analyzed and viewed within an open systems organizational framework. Through the use of metaphors relating to boundaries such as "boundary maintenance" and "boundary transactions", an open systems theory provides useful guidelines and decision rules which can be invoked when researchers negotiate access to businesses.

GAINING ACCESS TO WORK SETTINGS: A TALE OF TWO CITIES

"An interviewing survey of a sample of New Yorkers can be conducted without official permission from anybody, but a field study of a bureaucracy cannot be executed without the explicit permission of management. This poses special problems."--Peter M. Blau¹

The transition from the drawing board to the scene is a profound challenge for field researchers (Blau, 1964; Habenstein, 1970a). Like fishermen, field researchers can relate many tales about the sites which got away. The challenge is intensified when settings are located in the private sector and the researchers are agents of educational organizations. In this situation the investigators must cross institutional boundaries, a situation which invites interference from gatekeepers who guard the walls of organizations and the subunits within organizations. It follows that research projects, particularly those initiated by external sources, are cautiously regarded by most organizational members. The manifest concern of organizational gatekeepers is that the additional work load may hamper organizational efficiency or deflect energy from the achievement of organizational goals. However, latent concerns include unplanned and undesired exposure of informal practices², vulnerability to criticism, and lack of control over the research enterprise.

This paper analyzes problems encountered in gaining access to work settings in two large midwestern cities, Columbus and Cincinnati. These cities are the sites for a longitudinal and qualitative study regarding the processes involved in becoming a worker among out-of-school youth. The researchers carefully documented the contacts occurring between February 1983 and January 1984 with community organizations, professional associations and businesses; contacts which related to obtaining a sample of youth.³ Several hundred pages of field notes, correspondences and audiotape transcripts are the data for the analysis.

A review of self-expository accounts by other researchers alerts us to specific access and orientation problems that we can expect to encounter. For instance, Robert Habenstein's collection of articles in *Pathways to Data* (1970a) and Phillip Hammond's volume *Sociologists at Work* (1964) are replete with these insightful contributions. A prevalent dimension present in most of these accounts is the explicit recognition that gaining access is a social process sui generis. This conclusion is salient but potentially disastrous for researchers attempting to gain access to complex organizations but who lack complex social skills.

This paper addresses the specific concerns of gaining entry into formal and complex organizational settings, specifically businesses. A consideration of other researchers' experiences and our own field data has led us to identify six distinct factors which can be linked to the ease or difficulty of entry: (1) the gatekeepers' perception of the legitimacy and validity of the research goals, (2) the gatekeepers' perceptions of the researchers' institutional affiliations and support, (3) organizational power and authority of the gatekeepers, (4) timing of the initial request for entry, (5) organizational climate and environment and (6) the interpersonal skills and personal contacts of the researcher. The last factor on this list is idiosyncratic and beyond our direct control. The remaining five factors may be viewed within a conceptual framework of open systems theory drawn from the literature on organizational theory. Through the use of metaphors relating to boundaries such as "boundary maintenance" and "boundary transactions" an open systems theory provides useful guidelines and decision rules which can be invoked when negotiating access to work settings.

Impediments to Access

Gaining access to respondents is a common problem throughout all types of research. For survey research the issue takes the form of response rate; for longitudinal research, the problem is one of attrition, and for experiments, there is much concern over selection bias. But for field researchers who need to conduct observations and become intimately involved with a number of actors in the organizations under study, the stakes are higher. Indeed, an enormous amount of cooperation is necessary from host settings when the design is field based and calls for observations or intensive interviews.

A major influence on field research are sociologists who were present at the University of Chicago in the 1930s. These early investigators studied social phenomena in a large and, for the times, highly unusual range of settings including the taxi dance hall, the school board meeting room, and the flophouse. Robert Park, a major figure in the Chicago school, instructed his students to go outside the university walls and, "Get your hands dirty with research" (Berger, 1972, p. 38). For these field researchers and their successors, unobtrusive methods favored roles, such as becoming a member of a focal community (see e.g. Liebow, 1967; Lynd and Lynd, 1939; Park and Burgess, 1925; Thomas and Znaniecki, 1918; Wirth, 1928; Whyte, 1943); or a member of a focal organization (Barawoy, 1979, Kornblum, 1974). However, entry into complex organizations and business settings frequently precludes an unobtrusive participant observation approach. To gather information from multiple layers of organizations or to study specific work groups may require explicit permission from officials. Herein resides a major challenge.

Many field researchers have provided revealing accounts of their dilemmas and strategies used in gaining access to industrial and commercial firms.

Their problems in gaining entry revolve primarily around the three gatekeeping factors described earlier, namely, (1) gatekeepers' perceptions of the legitimacy and validity of the research goals (2) gatekeepers' perceptions of the researchers' institutional affiliations and support (3) organizational power and authority of the gatekeepers. Alvin Gouldner (1965) in his study of a gypsum plant decided to undertake a double entry negotiation process through both the company management and the union. This strategy worked to the extent of gaining official approval at the upper levels of both corporate and union management for conducting his study. But he was impeded by an organizational group, lower management, who presided over the particular plant. These lower level managers were gatekeepers to important information and their recalcitrance cast a shadow over the research enterprise. Upon reflecting, Gouldner realized that triple entry of negotiations would have been more appropriate:

"But it soon became obvious that we had made a mistake, and the problem had not been to make a double-entry, but a triple-entry; for we had left out, and failed to make independent contact with a distinct group--the management of that particular plant. In a casual way, we had assumed that main office management also spoke for the local plant management and this, as a moment's reflection might have told us, was not the case. In consequence, our relations with local management was never as good as they were with the workers or with main office management (1965: p.256)."

Fortunately, Gouldner and his colleagues were not denied complete access, but they were indeed limited in their data gathering efforts. Gouldner's experience provides a telling illustration of difficulties encountered when gatekeepers do not consider research goals to be congruent with their perceptions of the organization's best interest.

In a study of bureaucracies, Peter Blau (1966) confronted mixed responses to his request for access from the organizations which he approached (1964).

Differential enthusiasm for Blau's project was clearly linked to differential organizational goals of the various work settings he contacted. Blau's initial plan was to conduct a comparative analysis of work groups in a public and private bureaucracy. This design was modified however after Blau was denied access by several of the private firms which he had targeted. Even among public agencies, Blau was concerned that his access was restricted to innovative organizations. As Blau surmises,

"It may well be no accident that all old established bureaucracies approached refused permission for the study and that both organizations that opened the way were relatively young ones, founded during the New Deal. Perhaps self-selection makes it inevitable that the organizations we study are least pronounced (1964: 24-25)."

Although Blau does not explicitly link his failure to gain access to a particular cause, his experience suggests that the gatekeepers of Blau's reluctant organizations perceived his university affiliation or research goals to be out of line with the best interests of their corporate enterprise.

After completing a study of professionalizing associations, Robert Habenstein determined that the level of confidentiality involved in the organizations's function is associated with cooperative or non-cooperative responses (1970b). Those organizations who must pay special attention to restricting the flow of information, like social welfare agencies, have "structural impediments" which restrict agreements for access. But Habenstein suggests that a well prepared and documented request to organizational officials and willingness to meet with organizational members is the most promising strategy.

In sum, discussions of access negotiations offered by field researchers suggest the importance to the researcher of a careful, preliminary organizational analysis for successful attempts at gaining access. Gouldner, for

instance, underestimated the power of coalitions in his focal organization; Blau was unable to enter allegedly rigid bureaucratic gates; and Habenstein identifies structural impediments related to the technical core of organizations (e.g. confidentiality of information flow). In view of these suggested gatekeeping restrictions, some positive effects may be gained from familiarity with organizational analysis—particularly "open systems theory".

Boundaries

An open systems theory approach to organizations helps us to understand how members of organizations relate to outsiders. Open systems theory was developed within psychology by Daniel Katz and Robert Kahn (1968). Among sociologists, the work of James Thompson (1967) has been of major importance. Unlike closed systems theories, this approach, from both the psychological and sociological perspectives, recognizes the salience of environment in organizational behavior.

A social-psychological view of organizations vis-a-vis open systems theory assigns an organic view of organizations. In other words organizations can be viewed as systems which operate within an environmental context. The divisions (or lines of demarcation) between organizations and their environments are referred to as "system boundaries." As defined by John Miner in his review of open systems, boundaries are "those barriers between system and environment that determine degrees of openness for the system (1982: p. 172)."

Not only does an organization have boundaries between itself and the environment, an organization also has boundaries among its own subsystems. These subsystems are categorized by Katz and Kahn as: (1) production or technical (concerned with products throughputs), (2) supportive (concerned with resource acquisition and distribution and inter-organizational rela-

tions), (3) maintenance (human resource functions), (4) adaptive (strategic planning) and (5) managerial (coordination and control over operations). An outsider needs to be aware of these divisions and the propriety attached to each. For instance, Gouldner had obtained privileges from managerial officials to study phenomenon in the production subsystem. But failure to recognize the authority of the officials in the production subsystem resulted in resistance from these individuals.

Those activities which involve crossover, either between subsystems or between the system and the environment, are conceptualized as being either boundary spanning activities or boundary transactions. The term "spanning" connotes bridging activities among organizational members. The term "transactions" connotes interactions between organizational members and outsiders. Field researchers need to be especially sensitive to boundary interactions because such activities call into play the vested interests of a number of key players.

The importance of boundaries in viewing organizations relates to a basic tenet of management among complex and allegedly "rational" organizations, namely an effort to reduce uncertainty. As Thompson describes organizations, rational organizations attempt to seal off their technical functions from their environment. These attempts are undertaken in order to provide closed system characteristics to an acknowledged open system. The intended effects are to minimize the influence of the environment over the functions of the organization. Boundaries protect, and buffer, and smooth over uncertainty.

Boundary maintenance, or protection, is particularly applicable to organizations which exist in highly uncertain or changing environments. These environments are characterized as a "turbulent field" by Fred Emery and Eric Trist (1965). Under conditions of rampant change and uncertainty in relation

to organization's position among competitors, there is increasing concern for protection and a prevalence of xenophobias. In other words, as we suggested earlier, timing of the request to conduct research is all important. An organization undergoing rapid structural transformation or beset by economic uncertainty is likely to show little enthusiasm for an observational research enterprise.

This overview of boundary constructs in open systems theory can be woven in and out of our own attempts at gaining access to work settings. An account of these attempts and an analytical examination will now be discussed.

The Tale

Design and Procedures

The sampling plan for our field study included locating approximately twenty to thirty youths, for the primary focus of our research. These youth were to be identified in two cities. The data gathering design included 96 hours of worksite observations of each newly hired youth to be conducted according to a bimonthly schedule beginning with the first day of work and extending over the course of one year. Interviews were also to be conducted with the youth and their ancillary others such as coworkers, family, friends, and former teachers. Finally, interviews with employers and access to official documents were to provide additional information.

In accordance with this design, consent to participate had to be obtained from the youth. Simultaneously, cooperation from the employers was essential. A tactical decision was made to identify the youth participants via their employers. There are three reasons for this decision. First, we didn't want to jeopardize the youth's chances for employment by tagging participation in a research study to their application for jobs. Second, the cooperation of

employers was perceived as a more difficult negotiation than the cooperation of youth. Third, identifying those employers who hired out-of-school youth permitted the researchers to purposively sample among work sites from different segments of the economy.

The process of gaining access was continual throughout the study period (one year) as youth moved in and out of jobs and as changes occurred among managers. The report of access negotiations described here will be restricted to the initial negotiations, that is, those negotiations which resulted in enlisting young workers into the sample.

First Stage

The first stage of gaining access involved identifying the sectors of the local economies of the two Ohio cities and identifying specific employers who were likely to hire young entry level workers within these sectors. Some of the events which occurred during this stage were discouraging and disheartening. At this point we were primarily negotiating with organizational brokers, individuals not connected to the firms we wished to enter, but who, rather were occupants of such roles as agency director, program planner and the like. Most occupied transaction roles of some variety. One was an executive on leave from a major national corporation whose current role was to establish corporate-education linkages through the jobs for America Graduates program (JAG). Another was the director of vocational education for a city school system. A third was the corporate liaison for a university of Cincinnati's fund raising office. Although some of these brokers were extremely helpful, such problems like attempts at cooptation, curt refusals, and false promises occurred with others.

The researchers attempted to identify the universe of local employers through nominations by these and other brokers connected to the youth labor market. Six industrial sectors were distinguished through these discussions: (1) Banks, (2) Insurance, (3) Government, (4) Service, (5) Light Manufacturing and (6) Heavy Manufacturing. Although identifying industrial sectors was facile and fairly consensual, identifying employers was more problematic.

One personnel association challenged the researchers to identify the pay-off to banking institutions and other firms for their cooperation. As a correspondence from an official of this association states:

"On a personal note, please give a great deal of thought to what you can provide the company who participates. Some companies will turn the questions back to you and force you to convince them that what you are doing will benefit them (2/11/83)."

Even after the researchers presented the request for assistance in identifying firms at an executive meeting, and after an article was printed in the association's newsletter, no cooperation came from this contact. Fortunately, this rebuff occurred early in the process of our attempts at gaining access and taught us an important lesson. After this rejection, we prepared a rather "slick" one page project profile outlining our research needs and enumerating the benefits to employers for participation in the research.

More threatening to the integrity of the research, however, was the reaction of a county official associated with CETA. This individual agreed to provide contacts in firms only if the researchers modified the study design. He was concerned about the implications of observational activities on the first day of a new job--fearing that this would have a negative effect on performance causing the new worker to feel self-conscious. The researchers rejected this scenario, arguing that discussion prior to the worker's first day of work would set the stage for our role as a "shadow" from the initial

day of employment and for up to a one years period to follow. Faced with our reluctance to comply with his fears, the official threatened to call every employer in town and to inform them not to cooperate. Fortunately, he did not carry out his threat.

An official from the JAG Program offered to distribute the researchers' request to companies but did not follow through. His uncooperative position was patently clear in his discussion of his views of the educational establishment. The interview transcripts reveal his bias and should have forewarned us not to expect his assistance:

"The basic problem can be summarized as that the kids are coming into the workplace poorly prepared in three areas. They're poorly prepared in basic employability skills (motivation, knowing what it is to get on the job and stay there and so on) and that basic stuff, and they are unprepared in adequate vocational skills. Those three things are the things that we said at least that we are going to try to deal with because we think that the business community can help in dealing with them. We also said a couple of other things that have been operative. One of them is the educational community, which is back to the point that you are making. It doesn't really take responsibility for the employability of their graduates. They haven't accepted that as their responsibility, they have no mechanism for doing it . . . (March, 1984) "

This official's best interests were in opposition to our research affiliation which involved funding from the National Institute of Education. His program utilized a training plan engineered by private industry rather than a plan worked out with the educational establishment. Other contacts with representatives from education, business, and government agencies were also affected by the political and social context at the time when our access negotiations were occurring in the the Spring of 1983. This was a time of transition in the job training world. Federal legislation had eliminated CETA. The responsibility for training programs was being shifted to the Private Industry Councils (PICS) under the guidelines of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). Officials whom we met were sensitive about their

redefined roles. In a sense, the ground was moving in the job training arena—resulting in unstable and unclear relationships between education programs and private industry on the one hand and both of these institutions and the federal government on the other hand. The prevalence of boundary maintenance activities encountered by the researchers during this period can be partially explained by this contextual information.

Assistance in identifying employers ultimately was provided by school officials in Columbus and by an array of sources in Cincinnati. Vocational educational administrators in Columbus provided the researchers with a list of companies and contact people sorted by the predefined economic sector categories. These contacts were companies that had hired graduates from the school system in recent years. Cincinnati contacts were provided by the University Foundation, a fund raising organization on the campus with direct connections to well placed officers in major local firms, and through educational networks established by previous community involvement by the researchers in that locale.

Second Stage

Direct contacts with employers began in April of 1983. Some of these contacts resulted in immediate receptivity or refusal. Other contacts were sustained over a several month time period as permission had to be sought through various subsystems. A total of eighty-one contacts were made. Forty of these contacts or fifty percent used both written correspondence and a telephone or an in-person visit. The other forty contacts were made through correspondence alone. The complete depiction of contacts, distributed by city and industrial sector is presented in Table 1. There is a notable symmetry evident in the distribution across sectors between the two cities.

TABLE 1
ACCESS CONTACTS BY CITY AND INDUSTRIAL LABOR

Economic Sector	City		Sample
	Columbus	Cincinnati	
Banks	08	01	09
Insurance	08	02	10
Government	01	0	01
Service	34	17	51
Light Manufacturing	05	04	09
Heavy Manufacturing	0	1	01
	56	25	81

Ultimately, access was provided in fourteen companies to afford observations of twenty-five youth.⁴ These companies cover the array of economic sectors with the exceptions of the government and heavy manufacturing categories. Such a distribution is a realistic portrayal of the location of available entry level jobs for noncollege youth during this time period. Lack of representation in government and heavy manufacturing categories indicates the constricted hiring in these areas. Table 2 portrays the distribution of companies who hosted entry according to city and industrial sector. Again, similarities in the distribution between the two cities is striking.

The specific types of businesses and industries which permitted initial access are as follows: a sheet metal shop, a coin and stamp store, two exercise and fitness facilities, two financial institutions, two fast food establishments, one corporate headquarters, one appliance service and sales shop, one hospital, one bakery, one convenience store, and one fastener factory. Subsequent access has been gained in the following businesses and industries: a motel/hotel, a roller skating rink, a restaurant, a contractor, a department store, a day care center, insurance sales, band gigs, and the

TABLE 2

HOSTING COMPANIES AND PARTICIPATING YOUTH
BY CITY AND INDUSTRIAL SECTOR

	City				Sample	
	Columbus		Cincinnati			
	Company	Youth	Company	Youth	Company	Youth
Banks	01	02	01	02	02	04
Insurance	01	01	0	0	01	0
Government	0	0	0	0	0	0
Service	03	05	06	09	09	14
Light Manufacturing	01	04	01	01	02	6
Heavy Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0	0
	06	12	08	12	14	24

entertainment department of a major amusement park. As can be seen from this expansive list, considerable variety exists in the types of study sites.

This variety occurs across organizational dimensions such as size of firm, functions, occupational opportunities, technology, structure, and management-labor relationships.

The variance in the study sites necessitated some variance in the procedures used in gaining access. But two specific tactics were constant across sites. First, the researchers presented a clear, and tightly focused explanation of the research program, its intended effects and the consequences to the employer. The details of the research design were not important in and of themselves. But the specific involvement of the employer was essential. Second, in-person meetings were essential to the successful negotiation of entry. Telephone conversations and correspondence might be part of the contact, but the study was best explained in person.

In addition to the previously mentioned project profile, a letter was composed to specify the costs and benefits of participation by employer. This letter was business-like and not an altruistic appeal. The voice of the letter belonged to the employer and posed the following questions:

- Q1. What do you want me (the employer) to provide?
- Q2. How much time will it take?
- Q3. What type of businesses are involved?
- Q4. Will the information be private?
- Q5. How will I as an employer benefit by participating in this research?

The responses to these questions helped reduce uncertainty and hence provide a rational, closed system image to a skittish employer. Threats to the employer were further reduced by meeting the researchers in person. The study could be better explained this way and doubts, fears, and other uncertainties could be assuaged.

By using a business-oriented letter and by meeting employers in person, we were also able to minimize concerns about our status and organizational affiliations. In general, the employers did not perceive that our link to the university, community or National Institution of Education would threaten their subsystem after meeting with us. This concern about researcher status is well articulated by Mary Metz, in her account of building relationships with school teachers while doing field work. In her words:

"People respond to the presence of others in terms of a number of standard statuses. In this case it was important that I was young, a student, and a woman. Each is a low status not ordinarily perceived as wielding much power. Those characteristics thus made me less threatening to the adults than a man in the middle of his academic career doing an identical study. My personal style is normally mild mannered, and I make a conscious decision to use that style together with my unalterable statuses as a research strategy (1979: 257).

Similarly, the researchers did not exploit their credentials as a tool for gaining access, greeting employers and others on a first name basis.

A less constant aspect of gaining access relates to the original contact person. In some cases, the personnel or human resource department was appropriate. In other cases contacts made in this way were an impediment to

gaining access. Human resource departments are difficult gateways. Outside research activities can be viewed by personnel managers as competitive with their own efforts. In two or three instances, key personnel in this area felt they could benefit from the knowledge gained from this study. For example, the personnel office in a major national manufacturing company known by its innovative employee training programs was extremely eager to have us conduct research they saw as beneficial to their programmatic goals. But more often than not people in these departments erected a stone wall.

Generally, a more pliable entry point is a department manager or branch manager who becomes interested in the study. Interest may be developed for reasons related to practical business applications or for less strictly work-related reasons. For example, one branch manager in a fast food establishment wanted to reduce her employee turnover rate which had reached an astonishing level of 150 percent over the last year. A department manager in a corporate headquarters was hoping to learn more about his training and managerial style. Less business-oriented, one vice-president had some mutual acquaintances with the researcher and hoped to gain socially by offering cooperation.

The source of contact can be critical however in large organizations. Just as Gouldner found that triple entry would have worked better than double entry, we were also impeded in one organization by union officials. The management subsystem had delivered conditional approval with the final approval depending on union consent. The sequence of approval was problematic to the union officials however. While the local union president and his bargaining committee met with one of researchers, he stated that, although the union would give "all comers a hearing," he would in no way permit the study to occur. By obtaining permission to go ahead from management prior to any discussion with the union, the researchers were seen as management's tool.

There was little doubt in the union's eyes that results of the study would be used against workers during contract negotiations with management as had been the case with earlier management-initiated research. Clearly, the union should have been approached at an earlier point in time.

The Moral

The social character of research becomes patently clear when we follow Robert Park's advice to his students and get our hands dirty with research. The rules of behavior for the university or other educational establishment are not necessarily shared by the field settings which relate to our research. Successful access to field settings therefore requires an appreciation of the norms which govern our research focus. When these settings reside in business and industry, an understanding of an open systems analytical organizational framework is helpful to gaining access.

Open systems analysis directs us to learn about the environmental context for the target settings. This framework also points to the importance of identifying relevant subunits within an organization and the key individuals or groups associated with these divisions. Through such an analysis the researchers may learn when they are approaching an organization which is in transition, a situation which is difficult to cross over for the purposes of conducting research. Furthermore, any research conducted on such an organization would reflect the situational instability which is occurring within its walls. But officials from business and industry will frequently cooperate with research efforts if they are approached with the information that they need to reduce uncertainty about their work. Boundary transactions are indeed possible when researchers are well sensitized to the dimensions of organizational life.

FOOTNOTES

1. Peter M. Blau candidly discusses entry and orientation to bureaucratic field settings in an essay included in Sociologists at Work (1964).
2. These practices may be politically sensitive such as attempts to remain non-unionized. They may also reflect the idiosyncratic conduct of particular workplaces. For instance, one manager was disturbed by a case study description of his office claiming that it portrayed the work climate as being unstructured and wild--"like WKRP in Cincinnati (situational comedy television program)."
3. These data were perceived to be fruitful for a subsequent comparison of the experiences of the researcher in gaining access to a sample of newly hired youth and the experiences of youth in gaining access to jobs.
4. Multiple youth were introduced to this study from some of the sites.

REFERENCES

- Berger, Peter. Sociology: A Biographical Approach. New York: Basic Books, 1972.
- Blau, Peter M. "The Research Process in the Study of The Dynamics of Bureaucracy." In Sociologists at Work, edited by Phillip E. Hammond, pp. 16-49. New York: Bak Books, 1964
- Burawoy, Michael. Manufacturing Consent. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Emery, Fred E., and Eric L. Trist. "The Causal Texture of Organizational Environments," Human Relations, 18 (1965): 21-32.
- Gouldner, Alvin. Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. New York: The Free Press, 1965.
- Habenstein, Robert W., ed. Pathways to Data. Chicago: Aldine, 1970a.
- Habenstein, Robert W. "Occupational Uptake: Professionalizing." In Pathways to Data, edited by Robert W. Habenstein, pp. 99-121 Chicago: Aldine, 1970b.
- Katz, Daniel, and Robert L. Kahn. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1966, 1978.
- Kornblum, William. Blue Collar Community. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Liebow, Elliot. Tally's Corner: A Study of Negro Streetcorner Men. Boston: Little, Brown, 1967.
- Lynd, Robert S.; and Lynd, Helen M. Middletown in Transition. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1939.
- Metz, Mary Haywood. Classroom Corridors. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.
- Miner, John B. Theories of Organizational Structure and Process. Chicago: The Dryden Press, 1982.
- Park, Robert E., and Burgess, Ernest Watson. The City. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1925.
- Thomas, W.I., and Znaniecki, Florian. The Polish Peasant in Europe and America. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1912.
- Thompson, James D. Organizations in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Wirth, Louis. The Ghetto. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1928.

Whyte, William F. Street Corner Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Appendix A

Dear

I am studying young workers to see how they learn to handle new jobs. Attached to this letter is a profile of my study plans. To make this study successful, I need your help! I know that you will have further questions so let's start here:

Q. What do you want me (the employer) to provide?

A. I am asking you to help in two ways:

- o to introduce me to your new hires who are between the ages of sixteen and twenty two so that I may ask them to participate in our study,
- o to grant me permission to visit your workplace in order to observe the activities of your recently hired youth.

Q. How much time will this take?

A. I will be collecting information over a nine month period. Ideally, I want to observe the newly hired youth on their first day at work. Following that first day, I wish to return to the job site twice each month for four hours each time. Over a nine month period, this amounts to about 76 hours of my presence in each work setting.

Q. What types of business are involved?

- A. I am involving a variety of types of businesses in this study in order to compare how young people adjust to different kinds of work. This variety will include representation (but is not limited to) food services, insurance, manufacturing, automobile service, construction, and retail businesses.
- A. Yes, I will not identify the names of companies or people in our reports of this study. Rather, I am interested in the overall picture of how young people adjust to work.

page 2

Q. How will I as an employer benefit by participating in this research?

A. The outcomes of this study will provide specific ideas to help you deal with new workers. This study will lead to:

- o a better understanding of the problems of young workers
- o new ideas for training
- o ways to help new workers get along with others
- o a comparison of the effects of work environments

Such information can be very helpful in reducing turnover among new, young employees. Additionally, this information is valuable for influencing educational policy to make schools more effective in preparing youth for work.

Sincerely,